

## **CITY OF BELMONT**

### **PLANNING COMMISSION**

#### **ACTION MINUTES**

**TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 2008, 7:00 PM**

Chair Parsons called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m. at One Twin Pines Lane, City Hall Council Chambers.

#### **1. ROLL CALL**

Commissioners Present: Parsons, Horton, Mercer, Mayer, Reed, Frautschi  
Commissioners Absent: McKenzie (arrived at 7:20 p.m.)

Staff Present: Community Development Director de Melo (CDD), Senior Planner DiDonato, Associate Planner Walker (AP), Contract Planner Ouse (CP), City Attorney Zafferano (CA), Recording Secretary Flores (RS)

2. AGENDA AMENDMENTS – After polling the audience, it was decided to leave the agenda in the order presented.

3. COMMUNITY FORUM (Public Comments) - None

#### **4. CONSENT CALENDAR**

4A. Minutes of October 21, 2008

RS Flores stated that she had been asked to correct the Motion on Page 4 regarding 2411 Lincoln Avenue by deleting the phrase "with the condition that plans be submitted for the issuance of building permits."

MOTION: By Commissioner Mercer, seconded by Commissioner Frautschi, to accept the Minutes of October 21, 2008, as corrected.

Ayes: Mercer, Frautschi, Mayer, Reed, Horton, Parsons  
Noes: None  
Absent: McKenzie

Motion passed 6/0/1

#### **5. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

5A. PUBLIC HEARING – 1906 Lyon Avenue (Continued from March 18, 2008)

To consider a Conditional Use Permit and Design Review to install a T-mobile Wireless Telecommunications facility, consisting of six (6) panel antennas attached to the existing Mid Peninsula Water District water tank, and four detached equipment cabinets. The antennas would not extend above the height of the existing water tower.

Application Number: 2007-0006; APN: 044-051-140; Zoned: R-1B (Single Family Residential)

CEQA Status: Recommended Categorical Exemption per Section 15303 (e)

APPLICANT: Be Davies on behalf of T-Mobile

OWNER: Mid Peninsula Water District

PROJECT PLANNER: Jennifer Walker, (650) 595-7453

AP Walker summarized the Staff Report, stating that staff supported the project and recommended adoption of the attached resolution and conditions of approval. She called attention to a petition signed by neighbors

that outlines several concerns of the neighbors and had been received the day before the meeting. She answered questions from the Commission, noting that the applicant had not given a reason for not looking at alternative sites and had not submitted anything more specific beyond less than 50 cubic yards for the volume of cut that needs to be removed.

Referring to the questions raised by the petitioners, CDD de Melo noted that since the petition had been received only the day before, staff had not had an opportunity to provide a response. Relative to Items A and B on the petition, he stated that the existing water tanks were not the subject of the project under discussion and, referring to Item C, explained what is required as part of an application submittal.

Chair Parsons stated that he was not prepared to make a decision since the previously requested information on alternative sites had not been submitted. All Commissioners present agreed, except that Commissioner Frautschi added that if the applicant is asked to bring the proposal back they should support their case by providing dropped call data analysis and data from individuals in the affected area stating that this RF facility is necessary. He further asked for the same size map as the one provided before, as he felt that the new one was skewed.

Commissioner McKenzie arrived at the meeting at 7:20 p.m.

Chair Parson brought Commissioner McKenzie up to date on the discussion.

Since the Commission was not prepared to make a decision on this item, rather than opening the Public Hearing Chair Parsons obtained agreement from members of the audience who wanted to speak on this item that they would return when the item is back on the agenda.

MOTION: By Commissioner Mayer, seconded by Commissioner Reed, to continue the project to a date uncertain.

Ayes: Mayer, Reed, Mercer, McKenzie, Frautschi, Horton, Parsons  
Noes: None

Motion passed 7/0.

Chair Parsons informed members of the audience that they will be notified when this item next appears on the agenda and thanked them for coming.

Chair Parsons called a short recess.

#### 5B. PUBLIC HEARING – 2400 Carlmont Drive

To consider a Conditional Use Permit to convert 24 apartment units (22 studios and two one-bedroom units) within the 164-unit Bonnie Brae Terrace retirement home to assisted living units. The proposal includes no increase in building floor area.

Application Number: 2008-0047

APN: 045-012-040; Zoned: R-3 (Multi Family Residential)

CEQA Status: Categorical Exemption per Section 15301

APPLICANT: Sara Lambert

OWNER: The Lesley Foundation

PROJECT PLANNER: Damon DiDonato, (650) 637-2908

Commissioner Reed recused himself from this discussion as his wife is employed at the Bonnie Brae facility.

SP DiDonato summarized the Staff Report, recommending approval subject to the conditions attached.

For the record, Commissioner Mercer confirmed with SP DiDonato that there is only one elevator on the 4th floor and that there is not a condition from Public Works regarding construction equipment or location of dumpsters or staging of construction materials. SP DiDonato added that Public Works could implement that condition when the project is reviewed for a building permit, or it could be added to the conditions of

approval list. Commissioner Mercer asked if there is a record and/or projection of annual emergency calls to this facility. SP DiDonato stated that he was not able to obtain that data and deferred the question to the applicant.

Commissioner Horton ascertained that the only handicap parking spaces are one van-accessible and one car-accessible, which are accessed off of Lake Road. She pointed out that she did not believe this meets ADA compliance laws because, if covered parking is available for others it must be available for handicapped. SP DiDonato will investigate this item with the Building Official.

Sarah Lambert and Jenny Kinnerslep, representing the Lesley Foundation, owners and operators of the Bonnie Brae Terrace, addressed the Commission, making the following points and responding to questions from Commissioners:

- The population of the facility has moved from a younger population to a more frail and elderly population.
- They are not building an assisted living facility to bring other people in; they are building the services on the 4th floor to care for their existing tenants who require a higher level of service.
- They currently provide no housekeeping services so that the tenants who are in their 80's and 90's either have to have family come in to clean or have access to outside services.
- The 4th floor will not be a medical unit – they will provide a higher level of service for those residents that require more services.
- The Fire Chief, Fire Marshal and Police Chief met with tenants to answer concerns about placing the unit on the 4th floor. The way the Fire Department handles a fire situation is that they want the residents to shelter in place, and whether these residents are on the 4th floor or the 1st floor would make no difference.
- If it were located on another floor there would be traffic that will not need to be on the 4th floor except for the people who live there.
- Their licensing requires that they provide central heat and air conditioning, which they do not have throughout the building. It is much easier and less costly to bring it down from the roof than to bring it up through the building. The capital costs to make the conversion are provided by a grant from the Department of Housing and Urban Development so they have to make the best use of the dollars they have.
- They anticipate that the number of 911 calls will be reduced because there should be fewer accidents due to having the cleaning service and because medications will be monitored by a nurse on the 4th floor.
- What they are asking to do is to be able to provide a better living environment for their existing tenants with a higher level of service without changing the outside of the building.
- They do not expect to see vacancies in the assisted living portion, but if there are some they could bring tenants in from their other facilities or from the outside.
- There will be two additional staff for this floor and current part-time employees will be multitasking and working full time instead of part time.
- The two additional staff will be a registered nurse to provide supervision with medication assistance and a certified RCFE administrator. Other services not currently provided will be housekeeping, showering, an activities program and three meals a day plus two snacks, to be provided by the current employees by extending their hours. Residents will be able to have tray service for meals if they so choose.
- The one elevator in the center section of the building is large enough to accommodate a gurney and there are two other elevators that go to the 4th floor in other sections of the building.
- They have approximately 40 new tenants come into the building each year – roughly a 25% turnover rate. Given the age of the current population, there are more than enough people to fill the assisted living floor, but if people choose not to accept a higher level of care and they have no way of getting care other than moving to that assisted living floor they will have to move out.
- They are often in the position of having to ask people to leave if they can no longer care for themselves or their apartment. This is not part of their mission so the plan is to serve the existing population. They are not increasing the number units, it's only the level of care.
- It's up to Family Protective Services or Aging and Adult Services to find appropriate housing for people when they need a higher level of care than can be provided at Bonnie Brae, which is considered independent living for people over 62.
- At this time clients pay rent and a food program fee. They will be paying a care service fee as well for assisted living. The projection is to keep the total package under \$2,000.
- They have not looked for additional funding. They were awarded \$4.2 million. The restrictions on the funding are that they have to continue to operate the building as affordable housing for extremely low income populations. Other conditions have more to do with the income levels of the population they serve.
- They were given from the early part of 2007 until the end of 2009 to draw down the funds. They plan to open in September 2009. They are also looking to partner with San Mateo County Health Department work out agreements for additional care and support.
- In addition to the safety factor, there was a combination of other issues that led to the decision to locate on the 4th floor, such as the current location of the hot water system, the plumbing issues involved with

shifting the bathrooms around, asbestos abatement, and the electric systems.

- Commissioner Frautschi asked how Ms. Lambert reconciled the statement in Mr. Anderson's letter where he said that the Fire Chief told them to "get out as quick as you are able" rather than to shelter in place. Ms. Lambert responded that Mr. Anderson would have to speak to the Commission about that. She thought the Fire Chief said that it is important that they take the directions of whoever is in front of them in an emergency situation and if you're told to get out of the building as quickly as you can by an individual you need to follow that direction. It was not a general "everyone needs to get out of the building as quickly as possible."
- Commissioner Mercer asked if they have an evacuation plan in place for natural disasters such as a canyon fire or an earthquake. Ms. Lambert stated that they have an emergency plan that was draw up for all of the Lesley Foundation buildings and there are policies and procedures that identify what staff member is doing a particular operation at a particular time. She felt that the plan worked exceptionally well for the 2003 fire. In addition, vegetation has been taken away from the building and a full sprinkler system has been installed throughout the building. She did not believe the Fire Chief referenced a fire storm or earthquake when he spoke to the residents.
- Ms. Lambert thanked the City staff for their great help with the project.
- They do not accept Medicaid, but hopes the Federal Government will move to allow Medicaid to be used for assisted living in California, but except for a few pilot programs, that is not possible.

Chair Parsons opened the Public Hearing.

Jean Sherwin, resident of Bonnie Brea, spoke in opposition to locating the assisted living units on the 4th floor for safety reasons. She stated that there are 44 steps from the 4th floor as opposed to 6 steps from the 2nd floor.

Ralph Accuna, resident of Bonnie Brea, spoke in favor of the project and praised the staff of the facility. He does not want to move from there when he cannot take care of himself and urged the Commission to approve the project.

Dan Anderson, resident of Bonnie Brae, agreed in principal with most of what had been said and felt that structurally the building is safe. He felt that the 2nd floor is the safest location for the residents who need assistance getting out of the building and would be less expensive in the long run because there would be less electricity used and for numerous other reasons.

Gustavo Nunez, resident of Bonnie Brae, spoke in support of the applicant's request, praised the staff and noted that when the fire happened in 2003 the Fire Department was there within 3-1/2 minutes.

MOTION: By Commissioner Frautschi, seconded by Commissioner McKenzie, to close the Public Hearing. Motion passed 6/0/1 by a show of hands, with Commissioner Reed recused.

Commissioner Mayer had been concerned about the 4th floor issue given the nature of the population involved, but having heard the arguments and reasons for choosing the 4th floor was willing to go along with the proposal and could make the findings.

Commissioner Frautschi stated that he is in total support of transitional care and supports assisted living. He had health and safety issues around placing individuals who need the most care and assistance during the time of an emergency in a situation where they are the furthest they could be from the first responders, especially since there is only one elevator to serve the area. He added that he favors models where assisted living rooms are interspersed with normal transitional care areas so that individuals who can do for themselves might be given the opportunity to do for those who cannot. He did not believe the applicant had to come up with other gap funds and questioned if they are eligible to apply for additional funds. He did not believe they would be doing the best thing by placing the neediest in the most helpless position.

Commissioner McKenzie did not see any objections by the safety authorities in the community and did not see that the safety issue of being on the 4th or 2nd floor had anything to do with the findings. He could make the findings and supported the project.

Commissioner Mercer commended the project and believed it will be a tremendous asset to the City of Belmont. She was concerned about emergency evacuation from the 4th floor, particularly in the event of a wild fire or earthquake, in which event firemen or policemen will likely not be available for assistance. She could make most of the findings with the exception of the emergency exit plan and would want to be able to speak to the Fire Chief about more alternatives that could be added to the project.

Vice Chair Horton could make all the findings, none of which apply to the actual location of the units. She believed that the fact that there was fire in the building without a sprinkler system and everybody was evacuated safely is amazing, and that sprinkler systems work and most people live. The system is fully up to date with all safety devices in place. She did not believe they could design around a possible disaster and understood why the 4th floor was chosen for a number of different reasons, not the least of which is cost.

Chair Parsons thought that the project as designed is acceptable and wanted to approve it. However, he had concerns about putting elderly people on the 4th floor. He was in favor of continuing the project until someone from the Fire Department could speak to them.

Battalion Chief Mike Gaffney, Belmont-San Carlos Fire Department, addressed the Commission on behalf of the Fire Chief and Fire Marshal, since they could not be present. Referring to the fire in 2003, he stated that the fire fighting effort went very well and that the residents pretty much self-evacuated. He made the following comments:

- During a fire in a building, the elevators are recalled to the ground floor and are inoperable; people need to take the stairwells.
- The building being discussed is all concrete structure – concrete floors, concrete supports, interior walls meet all the fire codes and were actually upgraded on the center tower on the third and fourth floor doorways.
- Since the 2003 fire, full sprinklers and fire alarms have been added throughout the building.
- According to the Fire Marshal, draft curtains will be added on the 4th floor to prevent spread of any fire and smoke.
- The Fire Department approved the project having, adding requirements that the alarm system be upgraded with horns, strobes and draft curtains.
- Once a steel curtain closes, people are directed to stairwells and there is typically a door within the steel curtain.
- Responding to Commissioner Mercer's question about evacuation of immobile people in facilities of this nature when emergency personnel cannot be there, Battalion Chief Gaffney stated that it could depend on the time of day and how much staff is on duty. Either staff, emergency personnel would evacuate them or they could shelter in place. The sprinklers would not necessarily put the fire out but they could hold it in check and prevent the spread of smoke. In a larger incident like an earthquake or a fire storm, a lot will depend upon what is going on in that area and the resources available. The facility should have an evacuation plan in place on how they will move those people. The elevators should be operable at that time so they could move people down and out of the building.
- Commissioner Frautschi asked if the Fire Department requires a separate evacuation plan and approach for a section of the building where the population would be less mobile or in need of more assistance. Battalion Chief Gaffney responded that he would have to refer that question to the Fire Marshal's office.

Ms. Lambert commented that there is a Knox box under the stairs for the Fire Department that contains a list of all of the current tenants identified by apartment number and if they are on a walker or wheelchair. She added that due to licensing requirements the assisted living units have to be in a specific area and cannot be scattered throughout the building. They anticipate that the people who live in these units will mainly be people who can no longer get down and scrub their bathroom floor or who want access to walk-in showers and laundry and transportation services.

MOTION: By Commissioner McKenzie, seconded by Commissioner Mayer, to adopt the Resolution approving a Conditional Use Permit to convert 24 apartment units within the 164-unit Bonnie Brae Terrace Retirement Home to assisted living units at 2400 Carlmont Drive (Appl. No. PA2008-0047).

Ayes: McKenzie, Mayer, Mercer, Horton, Parsons  
Noes: Frautschi  
Recused: Reed

Motion passed 5/1/1

Chair Parsons announced that this item may be appealed to the City Council within 10 calendar days.

Chair Parsons called a short recess and Commissioner Reed returned to the room.

#### 5C. PUBLIC HEARING – 1000 Broadway

To consider a Variance to allow a 123 square-foot addition to an existing 1,812 square-foot residence for a total of 1,936 square feet that is below the maximum permitted 2,665 square feet for this property. The addition would be setback 9'6" from the street side property line (Broadway frontage) where a minimum setback of 15 feet is required.

Application Number: 2008-0056; APN: 045-262-090; Zoned: R-1C (Single Family Residential)

CEQA Status: Categorical Exemption per Section 15301 (e)

APPLICANT/OWNER(S): Aaron and Kathy D'Amico

PROJECT PLANNER: Jennifer Walker, (650) 595-7453

AP Walker summarized the Staff Report. She called attention to a correction to the Project Data table on Page 4 that 15' is required for the side setback rather than 6'. Based on their analysis, staff supported the Variance request, noting that given any different circumstances, i.e., if this was creating a new setback for the side yard to less than the existing 9-1/2', she did not believe they would be able to make the findings. Staff recommended approval.

Responding to Commissioner McKenzie's question, AP Walker confirmed that the current roofline already projects into the setback – it is legal non-conforming on the Broadway side. The porch area as well as the existing enclosed floor area is 9-1/2' from the property line rather than the required 15'. There are permits for the existing structure and they have the right to keep it as is. Code 9.63 was changed about a year ago so that a legal non-conforming setback cannot be continued now. She also explained that for corner lots the front yard is always the shortest street side property line, and in this instance Sixth Avenue is significantly shorter than Broadway. It would not change if Broadway were the front yard setback; it would have the same 15' setback on both 6th and Broadway. Following that definition allows the applicant to make the front entrance on 6th Avenue rather than on Broadway.

Commission questions regarding the location of the front door, the structure in the lower left-hand corner of the lot and the antenna were deferred to the applicant.

Aaron D'Amico, applicant, stated that the structure referred to is an 8 x 9 x 6-1/2' high garage shed that was on the property when he bought it, and which contains garden tools. There is a walkway but the rest of the area is dirt and the tree is still there. The antenna is not used and will be taken down. The front of the porch structure will be re-built to the same dimensions as the front area with steps that go down so that people will enter from the Broadway side. The design will be different but the size will be exactly the same.

Chair Parsons opened the Public Hearing.

Brent Takahashi, Belmont resident and a local architect, stated that he has a tendency to avoid making Variances for setbacks unless there is some clear community benefit to it. After reviewing the elevation of the house as it now looks, he concurred with staff that he could see some benefit to granting the Variance and had no objection.

MOTION: By Commissioner Frautschi, seconded by Vice Chair Horton, to close the Public Hearing. Motion passed 7/0 by a show of hands.

Commissioners Reed stated that this is a very straight-forward improvement to the home and that he could approve the project. Commissioner Mayer concurred.

Commissioner Frautschi could make the findings and approve the Variance. He recommended that the chimney be painted and the antenna be removed. He would also like to see a Landscape Plan that would

address issues of softening, suggesting that the vegetation on Broadway should be removed and replaced, and that some of the hardscape be replaced with stepping stones or something similar.

Vice Chair Horton had no comment.

Commissioner Mercer commented that if they were being asked to do a Design Review she would require a Landscape Plan and removal of a huge amount of hardscape. She had difficulty finding that this is an extraordinary handicap because everyone on a corner lot has two frontages and limited space. She felt that they could have gotten additional space in other ways and found it difficult to make the findings. Objectively looking at it, she did not feel that they were extending the Variance since the non-conforming roof and foundation are already there.

CDD de Melo explained that the Commission can set conditions of approval but there needs to be a logical connection between the findings and the Variance, and that this project did not require a Design Review because they are not adding more than 400 sq.ft.

Commissioner McKenzie echoed Commissioner Mercer's sentiments and stated that he did not like the plan because it compromises the house for a few feet of added space in the kitchen and felt strongly that there are other ways they could have gotten the space.

Chair Parsons commented that, while they are not changing the footprint or roofline of the house, they are changing the exterior look of the house. He felt that a condition of approval for this project should be Landscape Plan that reduces the amount of hardscape and provides a detailed plan of what materials are being used to get from the front door out to the street and whether there is going to be access off of the side patio that is the front door. CDD de Melo stated that making that connection gives them the nexus to create the condition on landscaping and hardscape, linking it to the change in the front entrance. The connection is that the orientation for the building is changing for the front entrance and that is going to have an effect on the surrounding grounds.

MOTION: By Commissioner Mercer, seconded by Commissioner McKenzie, adopting the resolution approving a side yard setback Variance for 1000 Broadway (Appl. No. 2008-0056) with the added condition that the applicant bring back a Landscape Plan and front elevations illustrating the new entrance, access to that new entrance and a reduction of hardscape, and an investigation into the conformance of the antenna and shed.

Ayes: Mercer, McKenzie, Mayer, Frautschi, Reed, Parsons  
Noes: Horton

Motion passed 6/1

Chair Parsons announced that this item may be appealed to the City Council within 10 calendar days.  
6. OLD BUSINESS

6A. Emmett House 1000 O'Neill - Review of Outstanding Conditions of Approval  
CP Ouse summarized the staff memorandum, recommending approval of the landscaping plans, color scheme, fencing, gate and lighting details as proposed.

Answering questions from Commissioner McKenzie, CP Ouse stated that the plan was changed to 3-bedroom units after discussion by the Planning Commission in May because the 2-bedroom units did not flow very well and added that the parking requirement is the same because it is a planned development and because it is based on the number of units, not the number of bedrooms. She believed the marketability is there for 3-bedroom rental units for qualifying tenants. The addition on the back of the house is consistent with an addition that was there before the move and it is not believed to be an issue with erosion of the creek bed.

Commissioner Mayer raised questions about the Palm tree being retained, noting that it conflicts with the Oak tree, and for clarification of the plans for the bay windows.

Commissioner Reed asked if the subcommittee had considered any kind of weeping tree, since they were popular in the Victorian era. Chair Parsons thought they may not have been recommended because of the underground culvert and the water requirements for those trees.

In response to Vice Chair Horton's request, CDD de Melo stated that it would possible for Commissioners to go into the house at some point.

Commissioner McKenzie congratulated and thanked the subcommittee on their decisive actions and noted that he concurred with their choices.

Commissioner Frautschi supported the color scheme but still did not support the wire fencing, believing people will put their feet in it and change the shape. He agreed with the arched gate top, but felt they should reconsider the oval lawn due to water considerations. He would have preferred to see an Oak tree planted in the middle of the lawn area and elimination of the tulip tree on the corner. Chair Parsons explained that their reason for including the lawn was so there could be two separate areas for the two units, in the event the tenants have children of different ages.

Mike Garavaglia, architect for the project, clarified that cantilever towards the back is a 3-foot extension but the foundation is still at its original line—there are no structural implications, the building is not any closer to the creek. He added that they are looking for the heaviest gauge wire for the wire fence and that the landscaping and wooden armature should help with Commissioner Frautschi's concerns. He thanked the Commission for working with him on this project and felt that the subcommittee format was very productive. He strongly recommend that this format be looked into for future City projects, adding that the outcome is superlative and everyone looks forward to its final conclusion.

MOTION: By Commissioner Reed, seconded by Commissioner Mayer, to adopt the Resolution approving a Final Landscaping Plan, Color Scheme, Fencing, Gate and Lighting Details for the property located at 1000 O'Neill Avenue (Appl. 2006-0090).

Ayes: Reed, Mayer, Mercer, McKenzie, Frautschi, Horton, Parsons  
Noes: None

Motion passed 7/0

#### 6B. Review of Municipal Code Section 25 (Tree Ordinance) Continued from 11/6/08 Planning Commission Meeting

In order to bring the full Commission up to date on this item, CDD de Melo briefly reviewed the comments that were made by the four Commissioners who were present at the October 14, 2008 meeting, and asked if there were any further comments. He reported that the Parks and Rec Commission had met and agreed with the recommendation for a change in the make-up of the Tree Board.

MOTION: By Chair Parsons, seconded by Commissioner McKenzie, to 1) recommend to the City Council that the City move forward with at least some language changes to create a modified Tree Board composition, and 2) to have a few members of the Planning Commission, a few members of the Parks and Recreation Commission and staff serve on a subcommittee to work on potential language amendments to the Tree Ordinance.

Ayes: Parsons, McKenzie, Mercer, Mayer, Frautschi, Reed, Horton  
Noes: None

Motion passed 7/0

#### 7. REPORTS, STUDIES AND UPDATES:

CDD de Melo reported as follows:

7A. Motel 6 – 1101 Shoreway Road  
No update.



7B. NDNU (Koret) Athletic Field

Still searching for a date for a next task force meeting, which will likely take place the week of December 1st.

7C. Charles Armstrong School – 1405 Solana Drive

Has placed a call to the school to get the school, neighbors, City staff and Parks & Rec Commission representatives together to talk about issues going forward.

7D. Ralston/US-101 Landscape Project

Chair Parsons commented that the train station landscaping looks worse and worse; like the trees and groundcover are dying. He added that the San Carlos station looks like it is in a different (tropical) country.

7E. San Mateo Development – North Road/43rd Avenue

Chair Parsons mentioned that he would be available the following week to meet with CDD de Melo and San Mateo staff.

7F. 900 Sixth Avenue – Belmont Vista Facility

No update.

7G. Safeway – 1100 El Camino Real

No update.

Other Reports:

CDD de Melo mentioned that on Thursday, December 4th, there is a stakeholders/community outreach meeting for the Housing Element and the General Plan Amendments for the downtown village areas. The meeting will be held in the EOC Room, with overflow in the Council Chambers. The plan is to meet from 6:00 p.m. to 9:30 p.m. The meeting notice will be sent to approximately 750 people, which includes everyone within 500' of the economic development target sites plus neighborhood associations, regional groups, and commissions.

Commissioner Frautschi reported that the sign ordinance subcommittee will hold its first meeting on the following Monday.

Commissioner Mercer reported that Belmont 4H is having its fourth re-leaf tree planting on a lot on a City-owned lot on Hastings Drive, where they will plant 15 trees on Saturday morning, December 6th. Volunteers are welcome, including students needing community service hours.

8. CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 2008

Liaison: Commissioner Frautschi

Alternate Liaison: Vice Chair Horton

9. ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 p.m. to a Regular Planning Commission Meeting on Tuesday, December 2, 2008 p.m. in Belmont City Hall.

---

Carlos de Melo  
Planning Commission Secretary

CD's of Planning Commission Meetings are available in the  
Community Development Department.

Please call (650) 595-7416 to schedule an appointment.